



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

07/813,161 12/24/91 BRATTEN

J FSC-147

EXAMINER

POPOVICS, R

JOHN R. BENEFIEL
280 DAINES SUITE 100 B
BIRMINGHAM, MICHIGAN 48009

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1308

5

DATE MAILED: 07/10/92

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined

Responsive to communication filed on

3

This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152.
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6.

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. Claims 1 - 11 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. Claims _____ are allowed.

4. Claims 1 - 11 are rejected.

5. Claims _____ are objected to.

6. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable. not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).

10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____ has (have) been approved by the examiner. disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____, has been approved. disapproved (see explanation).

12. Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.

13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit 1308

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the recitation "adapted" is considered vague and indefinite. Preferred terminology is --constructed and arranged--.

In claim 6, the meaning of the recitation "forwardly away" is unclear.

Also in claim 1, the recitation "said perforate layer" lacks clear positive antecedent basis.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-2, 8, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bratten in view of Bahr.

Art Unit 1308

Bratten (4,774,010) discloses a filtering apparatus substantially as claimed. Claim 1 differs from Bratten by specifying a continuous loop of filter media belt. Bahr discloses a similar apparatus where continuous belts 14 and 15 (Fig. 14) travel through the press together. In view of this disclosure, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the apparatus of Bratten (010) by using a second belt loop in order to use less filter material.

Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bratten in view of Bahr as applied to claims 1-2, 8 and 9 above, and further in view of Ishigaki.

Claim 4 differs from the references as applied above by specifying a scraper. Claim 5 differs by specifying a trough with wash jet means.

Ishigaki discloses a filtration apparatus which employs a scraper 24 and trough 26 with wash jet means 25 (see fig. 1). In view of this disclosure, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the apparatus of the references as applied above by incorporating the above scraper, trough and wash jets in order to better remove the filter cake. With respect to claims 6 and 7, the parameters specified therein are considered obvious matters of choice in design to one skilled in the art. As such they are considered patentably indistinguishable from the references as applied above.

Art Unit 1308

Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bratten in view of Bahr as applied to claims 1-2, 8 and 9 above, and further in view of Lee.

Claim 10 differs from the references as applied above by specifying that the side edges of the permanent filters media belt are coated. Claim 11 further specifies this coating to be urethane plastic. Lee discloses the sealing of the edge portion with rubber (col. 1 lines 25-36). In view of this disclosure it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the apparatus of the references as applied above by applying a suitable impervious material such as poly-urethane, the modern day counterpart of rubber.

Claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to R. Popovics whose telephone number is (703) 308-0684.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.

RSP
7/6/92

R. Popovics/vd
July 06, 1992


STANLEY S. SILVERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 138